UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/624,445	07/22/2003	Alan Cox	0113715.00134US1	6446

68998   7590   12/22/2010
WILMERHALE / RED HAT, INC.
60 STATE STREET
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER
GOLDBERG, ANDREW C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2491	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/22/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

TERESA.CARVALHO@WILMERHALE.COM
whipusptopairs@wilmerhale.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 10/624,445
Filing Date: July 22, 2003
Appellant(s): COX, ALAN

Peter W. Baik
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 22 October, 2010 appealing from the

Office action mailed 28 April, 2010

(1) Real Party in Interest

The examiner has no comment on the statement, or lack of statement, identifying by name the real party in interest in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The following is a list of claims that are rejected and pending in the application: 2, 3, 8 and 18-30

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The examiner has no comment on the appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The examiner has no comment on the summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The examiner has no comment on the appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal. Every ground of rejection set forth in the Office action from which the appeal is taken (as modified by any advisory actions) is being maintained by the examiner except for the grounds of rejection (if any) listed under the subheading "WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS." New grounds of rejection (if any) are provided under the subheading "NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTION."

The examiner has no comment on the appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal. Every ground of rejection set forth in the Office action from which the appeal is taken (as modified by any advisory actions) is being maintained by the examiner except for the grounds of rejection (if any) listed under the subheading "WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS." New grounds of rejection (if any) are provided under the subheading "NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTION."

(7) Claims Appendix

The examiner has no comment on the copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the appellant's brief.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

- Lu, US 2002/0107950 A1

- Hickey, US 2002/0087646 A1

- Bulfer, US 2006/0036701 A1

- Sherman, US 2002/0194177 A1

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 2, 3, 8, 18, 23-25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Lu (US 2002/0107950 A1) in view of Hickey et al. (hereinafter Hickey)

(us 2002/0087646 A1)

Referring to claim 18,

Lu teaches a method for operating an electronic messaging system (Fig. 1a)

comprising: routing an electronic message intended for a first user (Fig. 1a, element

150) to at least two human approvers, wherein each of the at least two human

approvers maintains an independent copy of the routed electronic message, wherein

each of the at least two human approvers can approve or reject the electronic message

prior to the electronic message being routed to the first user (Fig. 1a, element 160, page

2, para.[0021]," Furthermore, <u>an electronic message may be **directed to one or more**</u>

<u>supervisory recipients 160.</u>");

presenting the electronic message to at least one of the approvers for approval or

rejection (Abstract," A message screening system includes routing to a supervisory

recipient an electronic message directed to an intended recipient. The supervisory

recipient then is allowed to screen the electronic message by approving or rejecting the

electronic message. The electronic message then is forwarded to the intended recipient

if the electronic message is approved by the supervisory recipient.")

determining whether the electronic message is approved or rejected by applying

a predetermined policy toward approval or rejection actions by the at least one of the

approvers presented with the electronic message; routing the electronic message to the

first user if the electronic message is approved (page 2, para.[0023], "The message

screening system may be configured to automatically screen an electronic message.

For example, lists of approved or blocked senders 110 may be stored at supervisory

recipient 160, or otherwise, to enable automatic screening of predesignated message

types or sender identifications. In one implementation, during the screening process,

the sender 110 may be added to the lists of approved or blocked senders by the

supervisory recipient 160. In another implementation, the MS server 140 may compare

the electronic address of sender 110 to the list of approved or blocked senders 110 and,

based on the comparison, either forward the message, reject the message, or allow

supervisory recipient 160 to screen this message of senders 110 personally, or

otherwise. Approval may include a manual procedure performed by supervisory

recipient 160 such as entering a command or pressing a key. Approval also may be a

default condition that is presumed to exist after a certain time period of inaction by

supervisory recipient 160 after receiving the electronic message. In general, MS server

140 generally forwards the electronic message to intended recipient 150.")

Although Lu <u>clearly</u> teaches at page 2, para.[0016], "For example, intended and supervisory recipients 150, 160 may include personal computer systems or other electronic devices such as a pager, a personal digital assistant, or a wireless telephone for communicating electronic messages.", and at page 2, para.[0022] "Supervisory recipient 160 may be provided with a viewing screen having one or more control panels that allow supervisory recipient to approve or reject the electronic message for receipt by intended recipient 150.",and [0023]," <u>Approval may include a manual procedure performed by supervisory recipient 160 such as entering a command or pressing a key."</u>, Lu fails to teach "once the electronic message is approved or rejected by one approver, notifying the at least one other approver of a changed status for the electronic message wherein the notifying includes providing to the at least one other approver an indicator to be associated with the other approver's copy of the electronic message, the indicator characterizing the changed status.

Hickey teaches at para. [0040] "<u>Any member of the group 22A1 can define one or more alternate delivery instructions for the one or more inbound electronic communications 53A1</u>. For example, each member of group 22A1 can specify a match criteria in a criteria template and then define in a notification specification rules to execute in when inbound electronic communications 53A1 satisfies the match criteria. The rules can prescribe, for example, an automated response or automated forwarding or <u>directing one or more electronic communications</u> from the received electronic communications 53A1 to **a selected mailbox** other than the default inbox 50A1 of the group electronic mailbox 25A1 assigned to group 22A1."

Hickey teaches at para. [0015], "It is still a further aspect of the invention <u>to</u> <u>provide an automatic method for updating and notifying members or users of a group of</u> <u>any changes in status information of received electronic communications</u>, the received electronic communications are being continually operated on by multiple members or users of the group to cause changes in their statuses.

Hickey teaches at para [0043] "In response to acts by one member of group 22A1 that cause a status change, a signal is transmitted to update the associated status indicator 57A1 for any other group member viewing the status indicator 57A11."

Thus, Hickey teaches:

1)   "a system and method is provided for multiple users to concurrently share one or more electronic communications",

2)   "each member of group can specify an automated directing one or more electronic communications from the received electronic communications to a **selected** **mailbox** other than the default inbox of the group electronic mailbox assigned to group." and then,

3)   "in response to acts by one member of group that cause a status change, a signal is transmitted to update the associated status indicator for any other group member viewing the status indicator. ("once the electronic message is approved or rejected by one approver, notifying the at least one other approver of a changed status for the electronic message wherein the notifying includes providing to the at least one other approver an indicator to be associated with the other approver's copy of the electronic message, the indicator characterizing the changed status.")

The reasons why Hickey came up with this system and method is stated in para. [0007], "some group members may be deprived of information regarding the received e-mail message and the actions taken by the other group members in connection with the message. In addition, there is limited control on the flow, distribution and processing of the information intended to be shared among the members of group 22."

Lu discloses a prior art, as stated above, upon which the claimed invention "once the electronic message is approved or rejected by one approver, notifying the at least one other approver of a changed status for the electronic message" can be seen as an "improvement". Hickey teaches a prior art comparable to Lu, wherein Hickey discloses 1)   "a system and method is provided for multiple users to concurrently share one or more electronic communications", 2)   "each member of group can specify an automated directing one or more electronic communications from the received electronic communications to a **selected mailbox** other than the default inbox of the group electronic mailbox assigned to group." and then, 3) "in response to acts by one member of group that cause a status change, a signal is transmitted to update the associated status indicator for any other group member viewing the status indicator."

Thus, the manner of enhancing the system and method of Lu was made part of the ordinary capabilities of one skilled in the art based upon the teaching of such improvement in Hickey.

Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been capable of applying this known "improvement" technique in the same manner to the system and method of Lu and the results would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art, namely, one skilled in the art would have readily recognized that wherein the shared

email communication deprives a sharing member of the information on the actions taken by the other member in connection with the changed status of the message, <u>Hickey provides the technique showing that "once the electronic message is acted upon by a first group member, notifying the at least one other member of a changed status for the electronic message</u>. Thus, the claimed invention would have been obvious to include "<u>provide an automatic method for updating and notifying members or users of a group of any changes in status information of received electronic communications</u>, the received electronic communications are being continually operated on by multiple members or users of the group to cause changes in their statuses.

Referring to claim 23,

Lu teaches the method of claim 18, wherein the electronic message is routed to the first user upon by being routed to a folder, accessible by the first user from multiple devices at multiple locations. (para. [0016] and [0017])

Referring to claim 24,

Lu teaches the method of claim 18, wherein the electronic message is deleted upon rejection in accordance with the predetermined policy (para. [0021]).

Referring to claim 25,

Lu teaches the method of claim 18, wherein the electronic message is archived at a location that is inaccessible to the first user upon rejection in accordance with the predetermined policy (para. [0021]).

Referring to claims 2 and 3,

Lu teaches the method of claim 4418, further comprising applying a filter to the electronic message, such that the electronic message is approved if the electronic

message passes the filter, and the method of claim 4418, further comprising applying

filter to the electronic message, such that the electronic message is rejected if the

electronic message passes the filter. (para.[0022]-[0024])

Referring to claim 8,

Lu teaches the method of claim 26, further comprising, if delivery of the electronic

message to the intended recipient is approved, sending a notification to the first user.

(para. [0021])

Referring to claim 26,

Lu teaches a method for operating an electronic messaging system (Fig. 1a)

comprising:

directing an electronic message to at least two human approvers, wherein each

of the at least two human approvers maintains an independent copy of the routed

electronic message, wherein each of the at least two human approvers can approve or

reject the electronic message (page 2, para.[0021]," Furthermore, an electronic

message may be directed to <u>one or more supervisory recipients 160</u>.");

presenting the electronic message to at least one of the approvers for approval or

rejection (Abstract," A message screening system includes routing to a supervisory

recipient an electronic message directed to an intended recipient. The supervisory

recipient then is allowed to screen the electronic message by approving or rejecting the

electronic message. The electronic message then is forwarded to the intended recipient

if the electronic message is approved by the supervisory recipient.")

determining whether the electronic message is approved or rejected by applying

a predetermined policy toward approval or rejection actions by the at least one of the

approvers presented with the electronic message; routing the electronic message to the

first user if the electronic message is approved (page 2, para.[0023], "The message

screening system may be configured to automatically screen an electronic message.

For example, lists of approved or blocked senders 110 may be stored at supervisory

recipient 160, or otherwise, to enable automatic screening of predesignated message

types or sender identifications. In one implementation, during the screening process,

the sender 110 may be added to the lists of approved or blocked senders by the

supervisory recipient 160. In another implementation, the MS server 140 may compare

the electronic address of sender 110 to the list of approved or blocked senders 110 and,

based on the comparison, either forward the message, reject the message, or allow

supervisory recipient 160 to screen this message of senders 110 personally, or

otherwise. Approval may include a manual procedure performed by supervisory

recipient 160 such as entering a command or pressing a key. Approval also may be a

default condition that is presumed to exist after a certain time period of inaction by

supervisory recipient 160 after receiving the electronic message. In general, MS server

140 generally forwards the electronic message to intended recipient 150.")and

Although Lu clearly teaches at page 2, para.[0016], "or example, intended and

supervisory recipients 150, 160 may include personal computer systems or other

electronic devices such as a pager, a personal digital assistant, or a wireless telephone

for communicating electronic messages.", and at page 2, para.[0022] and [0023],"

Approval may include a manual procedure performed by supervisory recipient 160 such

as entering a command or pressing a key." Lu is silent in   directing an outgoing

electronic message having an intended recipient sent by a first user to at least two

approvers prior to the electronic message being routed to the intended recipient " and

"once the electronic message is approved or rejected by one approver, notifying the at

least one other approver of a changed status for the electronic message wherein the

notifying includes providing to the at least one other approver an indicator to be

associated with the other approver's copy of the electronic message, the indicator

characterizing the changed status.

Hickey teaches at para. [0040] "<u>Any member of the group 22A1 can define one

or more alternate delivery instructions for the one or more inbound electronic

communications 53A1</u>. For example, each member of group 22A1 can specify a match

criteria in a criteria template and then define in a notification specification rules to

execute in when inbound electronic communications 53A1 satisfies the match criteria.

The rules can prescribe, for example, an automated response or automated forwarding

or <u>directing one or more electronic communications</u> from the received electronic

communications 53A1 to **a selected mailbox** <u>other than the default inbox 50A1</u> of the

group electronic mailbox 25A1 assigned to group 22A1."

Hickey teaches at para. [0015], "It is still a further aspect of the invention <u>to

provide an automatic method for updating and notifying members or users of a group of

any changes in status information of received electronic communications</u>, the received

electronic communications are being continually operated on by multiple members or

users of the group to cause changes in their statuses.

Hickey teaches at para [0043] "In response to acts by one member of group

22A1 that cause a status change, a signal is transmitted to update the associated status

indicator 57A1 for any other group member viewing the status indicator 57A11."

Thus, Hickey teaches:

1)   "a system and method is provided for multiple users to concurrently share one or more electronic communications",

2)   "each member of group can specify an automated directing one or more electronic communications from the received electronic communications to a **selected mailbox** other than the default inbox of the group electronic mailbox assigned to group." and then,

3)   "in response to acts by one member of group that cause a status change, a signal is transmitted to update the associated status indicator for any other group member viewing the status indicator. ("once the electronic message is approved or rejected by one approver, notifying the at least one other approver of a changed status for the electronic message wherein the notifying includes providing to the at least one other approver an indicator to be associated with the other approver's copy of the electronic message, the indicator characterizing the changed status.")

The reasons why Hickey came up with this system and method is stated in para. [0007], "some group members may be deprived of information regarding the received e-mail message and the actions taken by the other group members in connection with the message. In addition, there is limited control on the flow, distribution and processing of the information intended to be shared among the members of group 22."

Lu discloses a prior art, as stated above, upon which the claimed invention "once the electronic message is approved or rejected by one approver, notifying the at least one other approver of a changed status for the electronic message" can be seen as an

"improvement". Hickey teaches a prior art comparable to Lu, wherein Hickey discloses

1)   "a system and method is provided for multiple users to concurrently share one or

more electronic communications", 2)   "each member of group can specify an

automated directing one or more electronic communications from the received

electronic communications to a **selected mailbox** other than the default inbox of the

group electronic mailbox assigned to group." and then, 3) "in response to acts by one

member of group that cause a status change, a signal is transmitted to update the

associated status indicator for any other group member viewing the status indicator."

Thus, the manner of enhancing the system and method of Lu was made part of

the ordinary capabilities of one skilled in the art based upon the teaching of such

improvement in Hickey.

Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been capable of applying

this known "improvement" technique in the same manner to the system and method of

Lu and the results would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art,

namely, one skilled in the art would have readily recognized that wherein the shared

email communication deprives a sharing member of the information on the actions taken

by the other member in connection with the changed status of the message, Hickey

provides the technique showing that "once the electronic message is acted upon by a

first group member, notifying the at least one other member of a changed status for the

electronic message. Thus, the claimed invention would have been obvious to include

"provide an automatic method for updating and notifying members or users of a group

of any changes in status information of received electronic communications, the

received electronic communications are being continually operated on by multiple

members or users of the group to cause changes in their statuses.

5.   Claims 19-21 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Lu (US 2002/0107950 A1) in view of Hickey et al. (hereinafter Hickey)

(us 2002/0087646 A1) as applied to claims 18 and 26, and further in view of Bulfer at al.

(hereinafter Bulfer) (US 2006/0036701 A1) .

Referring to claims 19 and 20,

        Although Lu teaches (page 2, para.[0021],” Furthermore, an electronic message

may be directed to <u>one or more supervisory recipients 160</u>.”)(two approvers to approve

or reject the electronic messages). Lu also teaches at para. [0006], “In some

implementations, a supervisory recipient may be designated for an intended recipient.

For example, the intended recipient may be a minor child and the supervisory recipient

may be a guardian for the minor child. <u>The intended recipient and the supervisory</u>

<u>recipient may have related accounts within an electronic mail service.</u> Additionally, the

intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unique screen names

comprising a single Internet service provider account. Alternatively, the intended

recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unrelated accounts.”, Lu fails to teach

the method of claim 18, wherein, in accordance with the predetermined policy, the

electronic message is approved or rejected when either one of the at least two

approvers first approves or rejects the electronic message and wherein, once the

electronic message is approved or rejected by either one of the at least two approvers,

the other at least one approver will no longer be presented with the electronic message.

Bulfer teaches in Fig. 3 and at para.[0025]," The screen further includes a series

of checkboxes 204, for example, for enabling processing of the EPC message. In an

exemplary embodiment, the EPC screen display 200 include a delete message box

204a, an EPC box 204b, and an approve box 204c. By activating the delete box 204a,

e.g., checking the box, the message will be deleted. Checking the approve box 204c

results in the message being forwarded to the child client inbox 112 (FIG. 2), and

checking the EPC box 204b results in the sender becoming an approved sender

contained in the EPC list 114 (FIG. 2)." And also Bulfer teaches that the messages for

approval be delivered to "Approval Folder", Fig. 2, element 124.

Additionally Bulfer teaches at para. [0008], While the invention is primarily shown

and described in conjunction with Internet E-mail **accounts for parents** and children, it is

understood that the invention is applicable to message systems in general, such as

wireless messaging and voice mail systems, in which it is desired for a supervisory user

to filter incoming messages for a supervised user." (in accordance with the

predetermined policy, the electronic message is approved or rejected when either one of

the at least two approvers first approves or rejects the electronic message and wherein,

once the electronic message is approved or rejected by either one of the at least two

approvers, the other at least one approver will no longer be presented with the

electronic message.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to apply "account for parents" and "presenting a

message in Approval folder" of Bulfer to the teachings of Lu such that a screen display

enables any one of the parents (account for parents) to bring up the "approval folder" by

choosing the folder to open and approve messages and/or senders and then the

processed messages are forwarded to the E-mail client so that approved messages can

be accessed by the child and approved senders can be added to the control list.

Referring to claim 21,

Although Lu teaches (page 2, para.[0021]," Furthermore, an electronic message

may be directed to <u>one or more supervisory recipients</u> 160.")(two approvers to approve

or reject the electronic messages). Lu also teaches at para. [0006], "In some

implementations, a supervisory recipient may be designated for an intended recipient.

For example, the intended recipient may be a minor child and the supervisory recipient

may be a guardian for the minor child. The intended recipient and the supervisory

recipient may have related accounts within an electronic mail service. <u>Additionally, the</u>

<u>intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unique screen names</u>

<u>comprising a single Internet service provider account.</u> Alternatively, the intended

recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unrelated accounts.", and at page 2,

para.[0022] and [0023]," Approval may include a manual procedure performed by

supervisory recipient 160 such as entering a command or pressing a key." Lu fails to

teach method of claim 18, wherein, in accordance with the predetermined policy, the

electronic message is approved when both of the at least <u>two</u> approvers approve the

electronic message, and rejected when either one of the at least two approvers rejects

the electronic message.

Bulfer teaches in Fig. 3 and at para.[0025]," The screen further includes a series

of checkboxes 204, for example, for enabling processing of the EPC message. In an

exemplary embodiment, the EPC screen display 200 include a delete message box

204a, an EPC box 204b, and an approve box 204c. By activating the delete box 204a,

e.g., checking the box, the message will be deleted. Checking the approve box 204c

results in the message being forwarded to the child client inbox 112 (FIG. 2), and

checking the EPC box 204b results in the sender becoming an approved sender

contained in the EPC list 114 (FIG. 2)." And also Bulfer teaches that the messages for

approval be delivered to "Approval Folder", Fig. 2, element 124. Additionally Bulfer

teaches at para. [0008], While the invention is primarily shown and described in

conjunction with Internet E-mail accounts for parents and children, it is understood that

the invention is applicable to message systems in general, such as wireless messaging

and voice mail systems, in which it is desired for a supervisory user to filter incoming

messages for a supervised user." (rejected when either one of the at least two

approvers rejects the electronic message.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of "approval folder" and

"presenting a message in Approval folder" of Bulfer to the teachings of Lu such that a

screen display enables either both the parents or any one of the parents depending

upon the set up of their email accounts, as suggested by Lu, to bring up the "approval

folder" by choosing the folder to open and approve or reject messages and/or senders

wherein message screening can be conducted by either both the parents or any one of

the parents depending upon the set of their email accounts (wherein, in accordance with

the predetermined policy, the electronic message is approved when both of the at least

two approvers approve the electronic message, and rejected when either one of the at

least two approvers rejects the electronic message) and then the processed messages

are forwarded to the E-mail client so that approved messages can be accessed by the

child and approved senders can be added to the control list.

Referring to claims 27 and 28,

Although Lu teaches (page 2, para.[0021]," Furthermore, an electronic message

may be directed to <u>one or more supervisory recipients 160</u>.")(two approvers to approve

or reject the electronic messages). Lu also teaches at para. [0006], "In some

implementations, a supervisory recipient may be designated for an intended recipient.

For example, the intended recipient may be a minor child and the supervisory recipient

may be a guardian for the minor child. <u>The intended recipient and the supervisory</u>

<u>recipient may have related accounts within an electronic mail service.</u> Additionally, the

intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unique screen names

comprising a single Internet service provider account. Alternatively, the intended

recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unrelated accounts.", Lu fails to teach

the method of claim 26, wherein, in accordance with the predetermined policy, the

electronic message is approved or rejected when either one of the at least two

approvers first approves or rejects the electronic message and wherein, once the

electronic message is approved or rejected by either one of the at least two approvers,

the other at least one approver will no longer be presented with the electronic message.

Bulfer teaches in Fig. 3 and at para.[0025]," The screen further includes a series

of checkboxes 204, for example, for enabling processing of the EPC message. In an

exemplary embodiment, the EPC screen display 200 include a delete message box

204a, an EPC box 204b, and an approve box 204c. By activating the delete box 204a,

e.g., checking the box, the message will be deleted. Checking the approve box 204c

results in the message being forwarded to the child client inbox 112 (FIG. 2), and

checking the EPC box 204b results in the sender becoming an approved sender

contained in the EPC list 114 (FIG. 2)." And also Bulfer teaches that the messages for

approval be delivered to "Approval Folder", Fig. 2, element 124.

Additionally Bulfer teaches at para. [0008], While the invention is primarily shown

and described in conjunction with Internet E-mail **accounts for parents** and children, it is

understood that the invention is applicable to message systems in general, such as

wireless messaging and voice mail systems, in which it is desired for a supervisory user

to filter incoming messages for a supervised user." (in accordance with the

predetermined policy, the electronic message is approved or rejected when either one of

the at least two approvers first approves or rejects the electronic message and wherein,

once the electronic message is approved or rejected by either one of the at least two

approvers, the other at least one approver will no longer be presented with the

electronic message.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to apply "account for parents" and "presenting a

message in Approval folder" of Bulfer to the teachings of Lu such that a screen display

enables any one of the parents (account for parents) to bring up the "approval folder"

by choosing the folder to open and approve messages and/or senders and then the

processed messages are forwarded to the E-mail client so that approved messages

can be accessed by the child and approved senders can be added to the control list.

Referring to claim 29,

Although Lu teaches (page 2, para.[0021]," Furthermore, an electronic message may be directed to <u>one or more supervisory recipients</u> 160.")(two approvers to approve or reject the electronic messages). Lu also teaches at para. [0006], "In some implementations, a supervisory recipient may be designated for an intended recipient. For example, the intended recipient may be a minor child and the supervisory recipient may be a guardian for the minor child. The intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have related accounts within an electronic mail service. <u>Additionally, the intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unique screen names comprising a single Internet service provider account.</u> Alternatively, the intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unrelated accounts.", and at page 2, para.[0022] and [0023]," Approval may include a manual procedure performed by supervisory recipient 160 such as entering a command or pressing a key." Lu fails to teach method of claim 26, wherein, in accordance with the predetermined policy, the electronic message is approved when both of the at least <u>two</u> approvers approve it, and rejected when either one of the at least two approvers rejects the electronic message.

Bulfer teaches in Fig. 3 and at para. [0025]," The screen further includes a series of checkboxes 204, for example, for enabling processing of the EPC message. In an exemplary embodiment, the EPC screen display 200 include a delete message box 204a, an EPC box 204b, and an approve box 204c. By activating the delete box 204a, e.g., checking the box, the message will be deleted. Checking the approve box 204c results in the message being forwarded to the child client inbox 112 (FIG. 2), and checking the EPC box 204b results in the sender becoming an approved sender contained in the EPC list 114 (FIG. 2)." And also Bulfer teaches that the messages for

approval be delivered to "Approval Folder", Fig. 2, element 124. Additionally Bulfer

teaches at para. [0008], While the invention is primarily shown and described in

conjunction with Internet E-mail accounts for parents and children, it is understood that

the invention is applicable to message systems in general, such as wireless messaging

and voice mail systems, in which it is desired for a supervisory user to filter incoming

messages for a supervised user." (rejected when either one of the at least two

approvers rejects the electronic message.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of "approval folder" and

"presenting a message in Approval folder" of Bulfer to the teachings of Lu such that a

screen display enables either both the parents or any one of the parents depending

upon the set up of their email accounts, as suggested by Lu, to bring up the "approval

folder" by choosing the folder to open and approve or reject messages and/or senders

wherein message screening can be conducted by either both the parents or any one of

the parents depending upon the set of their email accounts (wherein, in accordance with

the predetermined policy, the electronic message is approved when both of the at least

two approvers approve it, and rejected when either one of the at least two approvers

rejects the electronic message) and then the processed messages are forwarded to the

E-mail client so that approved messages can be accessed by the child and approved

senders can be added to the control list.

6.   Claims 22 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Lu (US 2002/0107950 A1) in view of Hickey et al. (hereinafter Hickey) (us

2002/0087646 A1) as applied to claims 18 and 26, and further in view of Srivastava at

al. (hereinafter Srivastava) (US 6,374,292 B1) .

Referring to claim 22,

    Although Lu teaches (page 2, para. [0021]," Furthermore, an electronic message

may be directed to <u>one or more supervisory recipients</u> 160.")(wherein the electronic

message is routed to the at least two approvers). Lu also teaches at para. [0006], "In

some implementations, a supervisory recipient may be designated for an intended

recipient. For example, the intended recipient may be a minor child and the supervisory

recipient may be a guardian for the minor child. The intended recipient and the

supervisory recipient may have related accounts within an electronic mail service.

<u>Additionally, the intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unique</u>

<u>screen names comprising a single Internet service provider account.</u> Alternatively, the

intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unrelated accounts.", and at

page 2, para. [0022] and [0023]," Approval may include a manual procedure performed

by supervisory recipient 160 such as entering a command or pressing a key." And

accessible by the at least two approvers from multiple devices at multiple locations.

(para. [0016]).

    Lu fails to teach "<u>message is being routed to a single folder</u>.

    Srivastava teaches at Fig. 3, element 408 and at col. 4, line 52 - 65, "In the

described embodiment, the message store 304 is organized as a set of folders and user

mailboxes. The mailbox 401 is a container for messages where each user has an inbox

402 where new mail arrives, and can have one or more folders 404 where mail can be

stored. Folders 404 may contain other folders or mailboxes and may be arranged in a

hierarchical tree. Mailboxes owned by an individual user are private folders 406. In addition to a user owning a folder or a mailbox, a common user or group can share the ownership of a folder or mailbox as a shared folder 408. A shared folder is similar to an email group, but instead of messages going into each member of the email group's inbox, messages addressed to the shared folder 408 go into a private folder associated with each user." ("message is being routed to a single folder.)

Lu discloses a prior art, as stated above, upon which the claimed invention "message is being routed to a single folder." can be seen as an "improvement". Srivastava teaches a prior art comparable to Lu, wherein Srivastava discloses "In addition to a user owning a folder or a mailbox, a common user or group can share the ownership of a folder or mailbox as a shared folder 408."("message is being routed to a single folder." Thus, the manner of enhancing the system and method of Lu was made part of the ordinary capabilities of one skilled in the art based upon the teaching of such improvement in Srivastava.

Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been capable of applying this known "improvement" technique in the same manner to the system and method of Lu and the results would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art, namely, one skilled in the art would have readily recognized that wherein the shared email communication deprives a sharing member of the information on the actions taken by the other member in connection with the changed status of the message, Srivastava provides the technique of placing the massage in the single folder that is " shared folder.

Referring to claim 30,

Although Lu teaches (page 2, para. [0021]," Furthermore, an electronic message may be directed to <u>one or more supervisory recipients</u> 160.")(wherein the electronic message is routed to the at least two approvers). Lu also teaches at para. [0006], "In some implementations, a supervisory recipient may be designated for an intended recipient. For example, the intended recipient may be a minor child and the supervisory recipient may be a guardian for the minor child. The intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have related accounts within an electronic mail service. <u>Additionally, the intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unique screen names comprising a single Internet service provider account.</u> Alternatively, the intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unrelated accounts.", and at page 2, para. [0022] and [0023]," Approval may include a manual procedure performed by supervisory recipient 160 such as entering a command or pressing a key." And accessible by the at least two approvers from multiple devices at multiple locations. (para. [0016]).

Lu fails to teach "<u>message is being routed to a single folder</u>.

Srivastava teaches at Fig. 3, element 408 and at col. 4, line 52 - 65, "In the described embodiment, the message store 304 is organized as a set of folders and user mailboxes. The mailbox 401 is a container for messages where each user has an inbox 402 where new mail arrives, and can have one or more folders 404 where mail can be stored. Folders 404 may contain other folders or mailboxes and may be arranged in a hierarchical tree. Mailboxes owned by an individual user are private folders 406. In addition to a user owning a folder or a mailbox, a common user or group can share the ownership of a folder or mailbox as a shared folder 408. A shared folder is similar to an

email group, but instead of messages going into each member of the email group's

inbox, messages addressed to the shared folder 408 go into a private folder associated

with each user." ("<u>message is being routed to a single folder.)</u>

Lu discloses a prior art, as stated above, upon which the claimed invention

"<u>message is being routed to a single folder.</u>" can be seen as an "improvement".

Srivastava teaches a prior art comparable to Lu, wherein Srivastava discloses "In

addition to a user owning a folder or a mailbox, a common user or group can share the

ownership of a folder or mailbox as a shared folder 408."("<u>message is being routed to a</u>

<u>single folder.</u>"   Thus, the manner of enhancing the system and method of Lu was made

part of the ordinary capabilities of one skilled in the art based upon the teaching of such

improvement in Srivastava.

Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been capable of applying

this known "improvement" technique in the same manner to the system and method of

Lu and the results would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art,

namely, one skilled in the art would have readily recognized that wherein the shared

email communication deprives a sharing member of the information on the actions taken

by the other member in connection with the changed status of the message, Srivastava

<u>provides the technique of placing the massage in the single folder that is " shared folder.</u>

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 2, 3,8 and 18-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Lu (US 2002/0107950 A1) in view of Bulfer at al. (hereinafter Bulfer)

(US 2006/0036701 A1), and further in view of Sherman et al (hereinafter Sherman)(US

2002/0194177 A1)

Referring to claim 18,

Lu teaches a method for operating an electronic messaging system (Fig. 1a)

comprising:

routing an electronic message intended for a first user (Fig. 1a, element 150) to

at least two human approvers, wherein each of the at least two human approvers

maintains an independent copy of the routed electronic message, wherein each of the at

least two human approvers can approve or reject the electronic message prior to the

electronic message being routed to the first user (Fig. 1a, element 160, page 2,

para.[0021]," Furthermore, an electronic message may be directed to <u>one or more</u>

<u>supervisory recipients 160.</u>");

presenting the electronic message to at least one of the approvers for approval or

rejection (Abstract," A message screening system includes routing to a supervisory

recipient an electronic message directed to an intended recipient. The supervisory

recipient then is allowed to screen the electronic message by approving or rejecting the

electronic message. The electronic message then is forwarded to the intended recipient

if the electronic message is approved by the supervisory recipient.")

determining whether the electronic message is approved or rejected by applying

a predetermined policy toward approval or rejection actions by the at least one of the

approvers presented with the electronic message; routing the electronic message to the

first user if the electronic message is approved (page 2, para.[0023], "The message

screening system may be configured to automatically screen an electronic message.

For example, lists of approved or blocked senders 110 may be stored at supervisory

recipient 160, or otherwise, to enable automatic screening of predesignated message

types or sender identifications. In one implementation, during the screening process,

the sender 110 may be added to the lists of approved or blocked senders by the

supervisory recipient 160. In another implementation, the MS server 140 may compare

the electronic address of sender 110 to the list of approved or blocked senders 110 and,

based on the comparison, either forward the message, reject the message, or allow

supervisory recipient 160 to screen this message of senders 110 personally, or

otherwise. <u>Approval may include a manual procedure performed by supervisory</u>

<u>recipient 160 such as entering a command or pressing a key.</u> Approval also may be a

default condition that is presumed to exist after a certain time period of inaction by

supervisory recipient 160 after receiving the electronic message. In general, MS server

140 generally forwards the electronic message to intended recipient 150.")

Although Lu <u>clearly</u> teaches at page 2, para.[0016], "For example, intended and

supervisory recipients 150, 160 may include personal computer systems or other

electronic devices such as a pager, a personal digital assistant, or a wireless telephone

for communicating electronic messages.", and at page 2, para.[0022] "Supervisory

recipient 160 may be provided with a viewing screen having one or more control panels

that allow supervisory recipient to approve or reject the electronic message for receipt

by intended recipient 150.",and [0023]," <u>Approval may include a manual procedure</u>

<u>performed by supervisory recipient 160 such as entering a command or pressing a</u>

<u>key."</u>, Lu is silent in "presenting a message in Approval folder" and "once the electronic

message is approved or rejected by one approver, notifying the at least one other

approver of a changed status for the electronic message wherein the notifying includes

providing to the at least one other approver an indicator to be associated with the other

approver's copy of the electronic message, the indicator characterizing the changed

status.

Bulfer teaches in Fig. 3 and at para.[0025]," The screen further includes a series

of checkboxes 204, for example, for enabling processing of the EPC message. In an

exemplary embodiment, the EPC screen display 200 include a delete message box

204a, an EPC box 204b, and an approve box 204c. By activating the delete box 204a,

e.g., checking the box, the message will be deleted. Checking the approve box 204c

results in the message being forwarded to the child client inbox 112 (FIG. 2), and

checking the EPC box 204b results in the sender becoming an approved sender

contained in the EPC list 114 (FIG. 2)." <u>And also Bulfer teaches that the messages for</u>

<u>approval be delivered to "Approval Folder", Fig. 2, element 124.</u> ("<u>presenting a message</u>

<u>in Approval folder"</u>").

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to apply "display depicting approval folder" (Fig. 3) of

Bulfer to the teachings of Lu such that a screen display enables <u>the parents</u> to

individually (one or more supervisory recipients 160) bring up the "approval folder" by

choosing the folder to open and approve messages and/or senders and then the

processed messages are forwarded to the E-mail client so that approved messages can

be accessed by the child and approved senders can be added to the control list.

However, both references, Lu and Bulfer fail to teach "once the electronic

message is approved or rejected by one approver, "presenting a message in Approval

folder" and "once the electronic message is approved or rejected by one approver,

notifying the at least one other approver of a changed status for the electronic message

wherein the notifying includes providing to the at least one other approver an indicator to

be associated with the other approver's copy of the electronic message, the indicator

characterizing the changed status.

Sherman teaches in Fig. 8A and 8B and para.[0059], viewing of listing of

messages by folders. Also Sherman teaches the subfolder synchronization at

para.[0065]. Also Sherman teaches that synchronization can be between server and

any of the user devices at Fig. 4 at folder or subfolder level of the any of the folder level

as depicted in Fig. 5. Sherman teaches at para.[0045]," The folder hierarchy illustrated

in FIG. 5 represents a typical hierarchy that is created by the user on a server or

desktop computer. When the user connects a companion device (such as an H/PC) to

the server or desktop computer, a subset or the entire set of folders may be

synchronized between the two systems. In order to identify which folders are to be

synchronized, a flag or electronic code is set on a parent folder. That is, an "expanded"

flag, which is set on a folder, pertains to the subfolder list of that folder and means that

its subfolders will be synchronized. In this manner, the subfolders themselves are not

necessarily individually marked in any way.", and at para.[0075]," In another example, a

user may be provided with a GUI screen or other UI methodology to explicitly select

subfolders that are to be excluded from the synchronization process."("notifying the at

least one other approver of a changed status for the electronic message wherein the

notifying includes providing to the at least one other approver an indicator to be

associated with the other approver's copy of the electronic message, the indicator

characterizing the changed status.")

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to apply the 'folder" and/or "subfolder level"

synchronization" for the mail objects on user owned PC and its companion devices (a

companion device (such as an H/PC) to the server or desktop computer, a subset or the

entire set of folders may be synchronized between the two systems. In order to identify

which folders are to be synchronized, a flag or electronic code is set on a parent folder.)

to the combined teachings of Lu and Bulfer such that the only required "folder" or

"subfolder", such as Bulfer's "approval folder", can be synchronized among the various

approval display devices used by more than one parent recipients of Lu.

The advantage is that one parent would immediately know what the other parent

approved thereby not repeating the approval action.

Referring to claims 19 and 20,

Although Lu teaches (page 2, para.[0021]," Furthermore, an electronic message

may be directed to one or more supervisory recipients 160.")(two approvers to approve

or reject the electronic messages). Lu also teaches at para. [0006], "In some

implementations, a supervisory recipient may be designated for an intended recipient.

For example, the intended recipient may be a minor child and the supervisory recipient

may be a guardian for the minor child. <u>The intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have related accounts within an electronic mail service.</u> Additionally, the intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unique screen names comprising a single Internet service provider account. Alternatively, the intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unrelated accounts.", Lu fails to teach the method of claim 18, wherein, in accordance with the predetermined policy, the electronic message is approved or rejected when either one of the at least two approvers first approves or rejects the electronic message and wherein, once the electronic message is approved or rejected by either one of the at least two approvers, the other at least one approver will no longer be presented with the electronic message.

Bulfer teaches in Fig. 3 and at para.[0025]," The screen further includes a series of checkboxes 204, for example, for enabling processing of the EPC message. In an exemplary embodiment, the EPC screen display 200 include a delete message box 204a, an EPC box 204b, and an approve box 204c. By activating the delete box 204a, e.g., checking the box, the message will be deleted. Checking the approve box 204c results in the message being forwarded to the child client inbox 112 (FIG. 2), and checking the EPC box 204b results in the sender becoming an approved sender contained in the EPC list 114 (FIG. 2)." And also Bulfer teaches that the messages for approval be delivered to "Approval Folder", Fig. 2, element 124.

Additionally Bulfer teaches at para. [0008], While the invention is primarily shown and described in conjunction with Internet <u>E-mail **accounts for parents** and children,</u> it is understood that the invention is applicable to message systems in general, such as wireless messaging and voice mail systems, in which it is desired for a supervisory user

to filter incoming messages for a supervised user." (in accordance with the predetermined policy, the electronic message is approved or rejected when either one of the at least two approvers first approves or rejects the electronic message and wherein, once the electronic message is approved or rejected by either one of the at least two approvers, the other at least one approver will no longer be presented with the electronic message.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply "account for parents" and "presenting a message in Approval folder" of Bulfer to the teachings of Lu such that a screen display enables any one of the parents (account for parents) to bring up the "approval folder" by choosing the folder to open and approve messages and/or senders and then the processed messages are forwarded to the E-mail client so that approved messages can be accessed by the child and approved senders can be added to the control list.

Referring to claim 21

Although Lu teaches (page 2, para.[0021]," Furthermore, an electronic message may be directed to <u>one or more supervisory recipients</u> 160.")(two approvers to approve or reject the electronic messages). Lu also teaches at para. [0006], "In some implementations, a supervisory recipient may be designated for an intended recipient. For example, the intended recipient may be a minor child and the supervisory recipient may be a guardian for the minor child. The intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have related accounts within an electronic mail service. <u>Additionally, the intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unique screen names comprising a single Internet service provider account.</u> Alternatively, the intended

recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unrelated accounts.", and at page 2,

para.[0022] and [0023]," Approval may include a manual procedure performed by

supervisory recipient 160 such as entering a command or pressing a key." Lu fails to

teach method of claim 18, wherein, in accordance with the predetermined policy, the

electronic message is approved when both of the at least two approvers approve the

electronic message, and rejected when either one of the at least two approvers rejects

the electronic message.

Bulfer teaches in Fig. 3 and at para.[0025]," The screen further includes a series

of checkboxes 204, for example, for enabling processing of the EPC message. In an

exemplary embodiment, the EPC screen display 200 include a delete message box

204a, an EPC box 204b, and an approve box 204c. By activating the delete box 204a,

e.g., checking the box, the message will be deleted. Checking the approve box 204c

results in the message being forwarded to the child client inbox 112 (FIG. 2), and

checking the EPC box 204b results in the sender becoming an approved sender

contained in the EPC list 114 (FIG. 2)." And also Bulfer teaches that the messages for

approval be delivered to "Approval Folder", Fig. 2, element 124. Additionally Bulfer

teaches at para. [0008], While the invention is primarily shown and described in

conjunction with Internet E-mail accounts for parents and children, it is understood that

the invention is applicable to message systems in general, such as wireless messaging

and voice mail systems, in which it is desired for a supervisory user to filter incoming

messages for a supervised user." (rejected when either one of the at least two

approvers rejects the electronic message.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of "approval folder" and "presenting a message in Approval folder" of Bulfer to the teachings of Lu such that a screen display enables either both the parents or any one of the parents depending upon the set up of their email accounts, as suggested by Lu, to bring up the "approval folder" by choosing the folder to open and approve or reject messages and/or senders wherein message screening can be conducted by either both the parents or any one of the parents depending upon the set of their email accounts (wherein, in accordance with the predetermined policy, the electronic message is approved when both of the at least two approvers approve the electronic message, and rejected when either one of the at least two approvers rejects the electronic message) and then the processed messages are forwarded to the E-mail client so that approved messages can be accessed by the child and approved senders can be added to the control list.

Referring to claim 22,

Although Lu teaches (page 2, para.[0021]," Furthermore, an electronic message may be directed to <u>one or more supervisory recipients</u> 160.")(wherein the electronic message is routed to the at least two approvers). Lu also teaches at para. [0006], "In some implementations, a supervisory recipient may be designated for an intended recipient. For example, the intended recipient may be a minor child and the supervisory recipient may be a guardian for the minor child. The intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have related accounts within an electronic mail service. <u>Additionally, the intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unique screen names comprising a single Internet service provider account.</u> Alternatively, the

intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unrelated accounts.", and at

page 2, para.[0022] and [0023]," Approval may include a manual procedure performed

by supervisory recipient 160 such as entering a command or pressing a key." And

accessible by the at least two approvers from multiple devices at multiple locations.

(para.[0016]).

    Lu fails to teach "message is being routed to a single folder.

    Bulfer teaches in Fig. 3 and at para.[0025]," The screen further includes a series

of checkboxes 204, for example, for enabling processing of the EPC message. In an

exemplary embodiment, the EPC screen display 200 include a delete message box

204a, an EPC box 204b, and an approve box 204c. By activating the delete box 204a,

e.g., checking the box, the message will be deleted. Checking the approve box 204c

results in the message being forwarded to the child client inbox 112 (FIG. 2), and

checking the EPC box 204b results in the sender becoming an approved sender

contained in the EPC list 114 (FIG. 2)." And also Bulfer teaches that the messages for

approval be delivered to "Approval Folder", Fig. 2, element 124. Additionally Bulfer

teaches at para. [0008], While the invention is primarily shown and described in

conjunction with Internet E-mail accounts for parents and children, it is understood that

the invention is applicable to message systems in general, such as wireless messaging

and voice mail systems, in which it is desired for a supervisory user to filter incoming

messages for a supervised user." ("message is being routed to a single folder.")

    Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of apply "account for parents",

"approval folder" and   "presenting a message in Approval folder" of Bulfer to the

teachings of Lu such that a screen display enables either both the parents or any one of

the parents depending upon the set of their email accounts, as suggested by Lu, to

bring up the "approval folder" by choosing the folder to open and approve or reject

messages and/or senders wherein message screening can be conducted by either both

the parents or any one of the parents depending upon the set of their email accounts

and then the processed messages are forwarded to the E-mail client so that approved

messages can be accessed by the child and approved senders can be added to the

control list.

Referring to claim 23,

Lu teaches the method of claim 18, wherein the electronic message is routed to the

first user upon by being routed to a folder, accessible by the first user from multiple

devices at multiple locations. (para. [0016] and [0017])

Referring to claim 24,

Lu teaches the method of claim 18, wherein the electronic message is deleted

upon rejection in accordance with the predetermined policy (para. [0021]).

Referring to claim 25,

Lu teaches the method of claim 18, wherein the electronic message is archived at

a location that is inaccessible to the first user upon rejection in accordance with the

predetermined policy (para. [0021]).

Referring to claims 2 and 3,

Lu teaches the method of claim 4418, further comprising applying a filter to the

electronic message, such that the electronic message is approved if the electronic

message passes the filter, and the method of claim 4418, further comprising applying

filter to the electronic message, such that the electronic message is rejected if the

electronic message passes the filter. (para.[0022]-[0024])

Referring to claim 8,

Lu teaches the method of claim -1-524, further comprising, if delivery of the

electronic message to the intended recipient is approved, sending a notification to

the first user. (para. [0021])

Referring to claim 26,

Lu teaches a method for operating an electronic messaging system (Fig. 1a)

comprising:

directing an electronic message to at least two human approvers, wherein each

of the at least two human approvers maintains an independent copy of the routed

electronic message, wherein each of the at least two human approvers can approve or

reject the electronic message (page 2, para.[0021]," Furthermore, an electronic

message may be directed to <u>one or more supervisory recipients 160</u>.");

presenting the electronic message to at least one of the approvers for approval or

rejection (Abstract," A message screening system includes routing to a supervisory

recipient an electronic message directed to an intended recipient. The supervisory

recipient then is allowed to screen the electronic message by approving or rejecting the

electronic message. The electronic message then is forwarded to the intended recipient

if the electronic message is approved by the supervisory recipient.")

determining whether the electronic message is approved or rejected by applying

a predetermined policy toward approval or rejection actions by the at least one of the

approvers presented with the electronic message; routing the electronic message to the

first user if the electronic message is approved (page 2, para.[0023], "The message

screening system may be configured to automatically screen an electronic message.

For example, lists of approved or blocked senders 110 may be stored at supervisory

recipient 160, or otherwise, to enable automatic screening of predesignated message

types or sender identifications. In one implementation, during the screening process,

the sender 110 may be added to the lists of approved or blocked senders by the

supervisory recipient 160. In another implementation, the MS server 140 may compare

the electronic address of sender 110 to the list of approved or blocked senders 110 and,

based on the comparison, either forward the message, reject the message, or allow

supervisory recipient 160 to screen this message of senders 110 personally, or

otherwise. Approval may include a manual procedure performed by supervisory

recipient 160 such as entering a command or pressing a key. Approval also may be a

default condition that is presumed to exist after a certain time period of inaction by

supervisory recipient 160 after receiving the electronic message. In general, MS server

140 generally forwards the electronic message to intended recipient 150.")and

Although Lu <u>clearly</u> teaches at page 2, para.[0016], "or example, intended and

supervisory recipients 150, 160 may include personal computer systems or other

electronic devices such as a pager, a personal digital assistant, or a wireless telephone

for communicating electronic messages.", and at page 2, para.[0022] and [0023],"

Approval may include a manual procedure performed by supervisory recipient 160 such

as entering a command or pressing a key." Lu is silent in "presenting a message in

Approval folder", directing an outgoing electronic message having an intended recipient

sent by a first user to at least two approvers prior to the electronic message being routed

to the intended recipient " and "once the electronic message is approved or rejected by

one approver, notifying the at least one other approver of a changed status for the

electronic message wherein the notifying includes providing to the at least one other

approver an indicator to be associated with the other approver's copy of the electronic

message, the indicator characterizing the changed status."

Bulfer teaches in Fig. 3 and at para.[0025]," The screen further includes a series

of checkboxes 204, for example, for enabling processing of the EPC message. In an

exemplary embodiment, the EPC screen display 200 include a delete message box

204a, an EPC box 204b, and an approve box 204c. By activating the delete box 204a,

e.g., checking the box, the message will be deleted. Checking the approve box 204c

results in the message being forwarded to the child client inbox 112 (FIG. 2), and

checking the EPC box 204b results in the sender becoming an approved sender

contained in the EPC list 114 (FIG. 2)." And also Bulfer teaches that the messages for

approval be delivered to "Approval Folder", Fig. 2, element 124. Additionally Bulfer

teaches at para. [0008], While the invention is primarily shown and described in

conjunction with Internet E-mail accounts for parents and children, it is understood that

the invention is applicable to message systems in general, such as wireless messaging

and voice mail systems, in which it is desired for a supervisory user to filter incoming

messages for a supervised user." ("presenting a message in Approval folder" to at least

one of the approvers for approval or rejection"). Bulfer also teaches at para.[0023]," It is

understood that the "reply to" field can be examined in addition to the sender

field."(directing an outgoing electronic message having an intended recipient prior to the

electronic message being routed to the intended recipient)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of apply "account for parents",

"approval folder", "presenting a message in Approval folder" and "examining reply to

filed" of Bulfer to the teachings of Lu such that a screen display enables either both the

parents or any one of the parents depending upon the set of their email accounts, as

suggested by Lu, to bring up the "approval folder" by choosing the folder to open and

approve or reject messages and/or senders wherein message screening can be

conducted by either both the parents or any one of the parents depending upon the set

of their email accounts and then the processed messages are forwarded to the E-mail

client so that approved messages can be accessed by the child and approved senders

can be added to the control list and the approved messages can be sent by the child

after examining "reply to" addresses which can also be added to the control list.

However, both references, Lu and Bulfer fail to teach "once the electronic

message is approved or rejected by one approver, notifying the at least one other

approver of a changed status for the electronic message wherein the notifying includes

providing to the at least one other approver an indicator to be associated with the other

approver's copy of the electronic message, the indicator characterizing the changed

status."

Sherman teaches in Fig. 8A and 8B and para.[0059], viewing of listing of

messages by folders. Also Sherman teaches the subfolder synchronization at

para.[0065]. Also Sherman teaches that synchronization can be between server and

any of the user devices at Fig. 4 at folder or subfolder level of the any of the folder level

as depicted in Fig. 5. Sherman teaches at para.[0045]," The folder hierarchy illustrated

in FIG. 5 represents a typical hierarchy that is created by the user on a server or

desktop computer. When the user connects a companion device (such as an H/PC) to

the server or desktop computer, a subset or the entire set of folders may be

synchronized between the two systems. In order to identify which folders are to be

synchronized, a flag or electronic code is set on a parent folder. That is, an "expanded"

flag, which is set on a folder, pertains to the subfolder list of that folder and means that

its subfolders will be synchronized. In this manner, the subfolders themselves are not

necessarily individually marked in any way.", and at para.[0075]," In another example, a

user may be provided with a GUI screen or other UI methodology to explicitly select

subfolders that are to be excluded from the synchronization process."(updating a display

according to a changed status for the electronic message "once the electronic message

is approved or rejected by one approver, notifying the at least one other approver of a

changed status for the electronic message wherein the notifying includes providing to

the at least one other approver an indicator to be associated with the other approver's

copy of the electronic message, the indicator characterizing the changed status.")

       Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to apply the 'folder" and/or "subfolder level"

synchronization" for the mail objects on user owned PC and its companion devices (a

companion device (such as an H/PC) to the server or desktop computer, a subset or the

entire set of folders may be synchronized between the two systems. In order to identify

which folders are to be synchronized, a flag or electronic code is set on a parent folder.)

to the combined teachings of Lu and Bulfer such that the displays of the only required

"folder" or "subfolder", such as Bulfer's "approval folder", can be synchronized among

the various approval display devices used by more than one parent recipients of Lu.

The advantage is that one parent would immediately know what the other parent

approved thereby not repeating the approval action.

Referring to claims 27 and 28,

Although Lu teaches (page 2, para.[0021]," Furthermore, an electronic message

may be directed to <u>one or more supervisory recipients 160</u>.")(two approvers to approve

or reject the electronic messages). Lu also teaches at para. [0006], "In some

implementations, a supervisory recipient may be designated for an intended recipient.

For example, the intended recipient may be a minor child and the supervisory recipient

may be a guardian for the minor child. <u>The intended recipient and the supervisory</u>

<u>recipient may have related accounts within an electronic mail service.</u> Additionally, the

intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unique screen names

comprising a single Internet service provider account. Alternatively, the intended

recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unrelated accounts.", Lu fails to teach

the method of claim 26, wherein, in accordance with the predetermined policy, the

electronic message is approved or rejected when either one of the at least two

approvers first approves or rejects the electronic message and wherein, once the

electronic message is approved or rejected by either one of the at least two approvers,

the other at least one approver will no longer be presented with the electronic message.

Bulfer teaches in Fig. 3 and at para.[0025]," The screen further includes a series

of checkboxes 204, for example, for enabling processing of the EPC message. In an

exemplary embodiment, the EPC screen display 200 include a delete message box

204a, an EPC box 204b, and an approve box 204c. By activating the delete box 204a,

e.g., checking the box, the message will be deleted. Checking the approve box 204c

results in the message being forwarded to the child client inbox 112 (FIG. 2), and

checking the EPC box 204b results in the sender becoming an approved sender

contained in the EPC list 114 (FIG. 2)." And also Bulfer teaches that the messages for

approval be delivered to "Approval Folder", Fig. 2, element 124.

Additionally Bulfer teaches at para. [0008], While the invention is primarily shown

and described in conjunction with Internet E-mail **accounts for parents** and children, it is

understood that the invention is applicable to message systems in general, such as

wireless messaging and voice mail systems, in which it is desired for a supervisory user

to filter incoming messages for a supervised user." (in accordance with the

predetermined policy, the electronic message is approved or rejected when either one of

the at least two approvers first approves or rejects the electronic message and wherein,

once the electronic message is approved or rejected by either one of the at least two

approvers, the other at least one approver will no longer be presented with the

electronic message.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to apply "account for parents" and "presenting a

message in Approval folder" of Bulfer to the teachings of Lu such that a screen display

enables any one of the parents (account for parents) to bring up the "approval folder"

by choosing the folder to open and approve messages and/or senders and then the

processed messages are forwarded to the E-mail client so that approved messages

can be accessed by the child and approved senders can be added to the control list.

Referring to claim 29,

Although Lu teaches (page 2, para.[0021]," Furthermore, an electronic message

may be directed to <u>one or more supervisory recipients</u> 160.")(two approvers to approve

or reject the electronic messages). Lu also teaches at para. [0006], "In some

implementations, a supervisory recipient may be designated for an intended recipient.

For example, the intended recipient may be a minor child and the supervisory recipient

may be a guardian for the minor child. The intended recipient and the supervisory

recipient may have related accounts within an electronic mail service. <u>Additionally, the</u>

<u>intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unique screen names</u>

<u>comprising a single Internet service provider account.</u> Alternatively, the intended

recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unrelated accounts.", and at page 2,

para.[0022] and [0023]," Approval may include a manual procedure performed by

supervisory recipient 160 such as entering a command or pressing a key." Lu fails to

teach method of claim 26, wherein, in accordance with the predetermined policy, the

electronic message is approved when both of the at least <u>two</u> approvers approve it, and

rejected when either one of the at least two approvers rejects the electronic message.

Bulfer teaches in Fig. 3 and at para.[0025]," The screen further includes a series

of checkboxes 204, for example, for enabling processing of the EPC message. In an

exemplary embodiment, the EPC screen display 200 include a delete message box

204a, an EPC box 204b, and an approve box 204c. By activating the delete box 204a,

e.g., checking the box, the message will be deleted. Checking the approve box 204c

results in the message being forwarded to the child client inbox 112 (FIG. 2), and

checking the EPC box 204b results in the sender becoming an approved sender

contained in the EPC list 114 (FIG. 2)." And also Bulfer teaches that the messages for

approval be delivered to "Approval Folder", Fig. 2, element 124. Additionally Bulfer

teaches at para. [0008], While the invention is primarily shown and described in

conjunction with Internet E-mail accounts for parents and children, it is understood that

the invention is applicable to message systems in general, such as wireless messaging

and voice mail systems, in which it is desired for a supervisory user to filter incoming

messages for a supervised user." (rejected when either one of the at least two

approvers rejects the electronic message.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of "approval folder" and

"presenting a message in Approval folder" of Bulfer to the teachings of Lu such that a

screen display enables either both the parents or any one of the parents depending

upon the set up of their email accounts, as suggested by Lu, to bring up the "approval

folder" by choosing the folder to open and approve or reject messages and/or senders

wherein message screening can be conducted by either both the parents or any one of

the parents depending upon the set of their email accounts (wherein, in accordance with

the predetermined policy, the electronic message is approved when both of the at least

two approvers approve it, and rejected when either one of the at least two approvers

rejects the electronic message) and then the processed messages are forwarded to the

E-mail client so that approved messages can be accessed by the child and approved

senders can be added to the control list.

Referring to claim 30,

Although Lu teaches (page 2, para.[0021]," Furthermore, an electronic message

may be directed to <u>one or more supervisory recipients</u> 160.")(wherein the electronic

message is routed to the at least two approvers). Lu also teaches at para. [0006], "In

some implementations, a supervisory recipient may be designated for an intended

recipient. For example, the intended recipient may be a minor child and the supervisory

recipient may be a guardian for the minor child. The intended recipient and the

supervisory recipient may have related accounts within an electronic mail service.

<u>Additionally, the intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unique</u>

<u>screen names comprising a single Internet service provider account.</u> Alternatively, the

intended recipient and the supervisory recipient may have unrelated accounts.", and at

page 2, para.[0022] and [0023]," Approval may include a manual procedure performed

by supervisory recipient 160 such as entering a command or pressing a key." And

accessible by the at least two approvers from multiple devices at multiple locations.

(para.[0016]).

Lu fails to teach "<u>message is being routed to a single folder</u>.

Bulfer teaches in Fig. 3 and at para.[0025]," The screen further includes a series

of checkboxes 204, for example, for enabling processing of the EPC message. In an

exemplary embodiment, the EPC screen display 200 include a delete message box

204a, an EPC box 204b, and an approve box 204c. By activating the delete box 204a,

e.g., checking the box, the message will be deleted. Checking the approve box 204c

results in the message being forwarded to the child client inbox 112 (FIG. 2), and

checking the EPC box 204b results in the sender becoming an approved sender

contained in the EPC list 114 (FIG. 2)." And also Bulfer teaches that the messages for

approval be delivered to "Approval Folder", Fig. 2, element 124. Additionally Bulfer

teaches at para. [0008], While the invention is primarily shown and described in

conjunction with Internet E-mail accounts for parents and children, it is understood that

the invention is applicable to message systems in general, such as wireless messaging

and voice mail systems, in which it is desired for a supervisory user to filter incoming

messages for a supervised user." ("message is being routed to a single folder.")

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of apply "account for parents",

"approval folder" and "presenting a message in Approval folder" of Bulfer to the

teachings of Lu such that a screen display enables either both the parents or any one of

the parents depending upon the set of their email accounts, as suggested by Lu, to

bring up the "approval folder" by choosing the folder to open and approve or reject

messages and/or senders wherein message screening can be conducted by either both

the parents or any one of the parents depending upon the set of their email accounts

and then the processed messages are forwarded to the E-mail client so that approved

messages can be accessed by the child and approved senders can be added to the

control list.

(10) Response to Argument

Response to Argument A

1. Regarding claim 18 Appellant argues that the following limitation is not taught by the combination of Lu and Hickey:

> once the electronic message is approved or rejected by one approver, notifying the
> at least one other approver of a changed status for the electronic message wherein
> the notifying includes providing to the at least one other approver an indicator to
> be associated with the other approver's copy of the electronic message, the
> indicator characterizing the changed status.

    a. Applicant argues:

> The Examiner states that Lu fails to teach this notifying limitation, and the Applicant
> submits that Hickey also fails to teach the notifying limitation at least because Hickey provides no
> status indicators associated with independent copies of an electronic message as claimed.
>
> ...
>
> message . . ." Hickey describes status indicators (e.g., status indicators 57yxz described in
> paragraph [0043]), but these status indicators are not associated with another approver's copy of the
> electronic message as the rejected claims require. Lu does not supply that which is missing from
> Hickey, because although Lu describes that an electronic message may be directed to one or more
> supervisory recipients, Lu fails to teach or suggest the "notification" limitation of the rejected
> claims. The Examiner notes this deficiency on page 8 of the February 22, 2010 Office Action.

    b.   In response to *a*, the examiner respectfully disagrees. In paragraph 0043 of Hickey, the "notification" is satisfied by the status indicators. It specifically teaches "It specifically teaches "Status information includes, but is not limited to, read information, acted upon information, and replied information." If all of the supervisors are looking at an inbox and a status indicator changes to inform the group of a change to the electronic mail, the whole group is "notified" (Hickey, par. 0015). That is, a signal of some sort is required to display the status change on a supervisor's machine.

    c.   Further, applicant argues:

A key point is that Hickey describes electronic communications as unique entities, without
reliance on copies, whereas independent claims 18 requires maintaining independent copies.
Hickey describes routing and/or operating on incoming electronic communications, and associating
status information with the communication based on those actions. Hickey, however, does not teach
or suggest directing multiple, independent copies of a particular communication to different users'
mailboxes. Doing so would go against the teachings of Hickey because Hickey relies on group
mailboxes when two or more users need to view the same communication. Hickey repeatedly

d.   In response to *c*, the examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to

applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show

nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are

based on combinations of references.   See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208

USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375

(Fed. Cir. 1986). The examiner is not depending on Hickey to disclose a

centralized email monitoring system. Hickey has been brought in to describe the

simple process of notifying other administrators of decisions acted upon by other

supervisors to an electronic email. Lu is responsible for teaching the

decentralized email monitoring system in which multiple supervisors may be sent

an individual copy (par. 0021, last line).

e. Further, applicant argues the difficulties described by Hickey in a decentralized

email monitoring system:

"The copies of the e-mail message in each member's box exist independently and
are not linked. Electronic mailboxes are configured for use by only one user at a
time. Thus, it is difficult for members of the group to coordinate their actions. For
example, it can be difficult to establish whether any member of the group has
responded to a particular received electronic communication without individually
contacting each member of the group. It can also be difficult to obtain other status
information such as how, when, and by whom in the group the communication is
being processed. Information that should be made available in a timely manner to
each group member may not be shared at all or at least not simultaneously."
(paragraph [0005]).

"Consequently, it can be difficult for different members of a group to work
collaboratively without frequent telephonic or electronic communications across the
whole group. Moreover, the lack of simultaneous sharing of all the electronic
communications intended for use by the whole group can severely impair an
efficient and coordinated functioning of a group." (paragraph [0008]).

"In the present invention, a system and method is provided for multiple users to
concurrently share one or more electronic communications. The electronic
communications reside in electronic mailbox that is accessible by members of the
group. When an authorized member of the group takes an action with regard to the
electronic communication, other members of the group can see what has been
done." (paragraph [0016]).

"Once the electronic communication is stored in the group electronic mailbox, any
member of the group can view the stored electronic communication and any
member of the group having an appropriate permission attribute can determine an
appropriate response or an action responsive to the electronic communication. For
example, an individual member of the group can select actions from a set of
response tools for performing desired functions." (paragraph [0028]).

This theme is repeated throughout Hickey. The group mailboxes of Hickey remove the
motivation for duplicating incoming messages. Hickey clearly teaches away from creating
independent copies of electronic communications as required by the rejected claims.

f.   Regarding *e*, the examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner is not

depending on Hickey to disclose a centralized email monitoring system. Hickey

has been brought in to describe the simple process of notifying other

administrators of decisions acted upon by other supervisors to an electronic

email. Lu is responsible for teaching the decentralized email monitoring system in

which multiple supervisors may be sent an individual copy (par. 0021, last line).

Secondly, In response to applicant's argument that there is no teaching,

suggestion, or motivation to combine the references, the examiner recognizes

that obviousness may be established by combining or modifying the teachings of

the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching,

suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in

the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988), *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992), and *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007). In this case, the two applications pertain to electronic mail monitoring and the *concept* of notifications was taken from Hickey to improve the system of Lu.

g.   Further, applicant argues about the notification not being associated with each approver's copy of the message:

> The Applicant notes that neither of these descriptions satisfies the requirement of " . . . wherein the notifying includes providing to the at least one other approver an indicator to be associated with the other approver's copy of the electronic message . . ." (emphasis added). The status changes referred to in these paragraphs concern modifications of one particular received message, and do not relate a change made to one approver's copy of an electronic message to another approver's copy of the same message. In other words, Hickey teaches that when any use of

h.   Regarding *g*, the examiner respectfully disagrees. As expressed above, Lu is presented to show the concept of a centralized email monitoring system. Hickey is used to show the simple concept of notification updates when a particular email is acted upon by a supervisor. After an email is acted upon, each user's screen is notified according to the supervisor's decision. The combination of the two references describes "an indicator to be associated with the other approver's copy of the electronic message..." Note that the claim makes no mention that a different decision can be made by two approvers. In fact, in claim 19 of the instant application applicant states that a message is approved or

rejected based on <u>one of the approvers</u>. The same goes for Hickey, in that everyone in the group of supervisors is notified when a decision is made by one of the approvers. The preceding claim therefor ignores the necessity of an independent e-mail copy by providing the same intended use when a supervisor approves/rejects an email.

i.   Further, applicant argues that Hickey describes disadvantages of using a decentralized system for notification:

> In the cited text, Hickey describes disadvantages associated with prior art e-mail systems that create copies of an incoming e-mail in separate mailboxes (i.e., "An e-mail 21 addressed to group 22 is received in the respective e-mail mailbox 301, 302 and 303 for the users 01, 02, and 03" paragraph [007]).
>
> Hickey's solution to the disadvantage cited by the Examiner above is to created group mailboxes rather than instantiate copies of the e-mail in separate mailboxes. The Applicant's claim 18, on the other hand, recites independent copies of the electronic message and relates those copies.

j.   Regarding *i*, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Paragraph 0007 of Hickey states, "It can be difficult for a member of a group 22 to determine whether an e-mail received from outside the group and distributed to group 22 is appropriately handled or not by other group members, thereby making it almost difficult to work collaboratively and/or simultaneously." Therefore, Hickey sites the difficulty, <u>not the impossibility</u> of notifications in a decentralized system. In fact, it appears that Hickey recognizes that this type of decentralized monitoring has been performed in the prior art and has labeled it "difficult".

<u>Response to Argument B</u>

2. Regarding claim 18, applicant's argument is the same as argument A for the reasons

    set forth above. Please see the above response to arguments.

Response to Argument C

3. Regarding claim 18, applicant argues that the combination of Lu, Bulfer and

    Sherman fail to disclose:

> once the electronic message is approved or rejected by one approver, notifying the
> at least one other approver of a changed status for the electronic message wherein
> the notifying includes providing to the at least one other approver an indicator to
> be associated with the other approver's copy of the electronic message, the
> indicator characterizing the changed status.

    a. Regarding claim 18, applicant argues:

> that neither Lu nor Bulfer nor Sherman nor any combination thereof teaches or suggests notifying
> the at least one other approver of a changed status for the electronic message, or any indicator
> characterizing the changed status. At page 33 of the Office Action dated February 22, 2010, the
> Examiner admits that neither Lu nor Bulfer teaches or suggests this limitation.

> ...

> The Applicant notes that none of these descriptions satisfies the requirement of "once the
> electronic message is approved or rejected by one approver, notifying the at least one other approver
> of a changed status for the electronic message . . ." (emphasis added). In fact, nowhere in Sherman
> teaches or suggests the "notifying" limitation as recited by independent claim 18.

> The synchronization described in Sherman cannot convey the change of status (i.e.,
> approved, unapproved) because it does not teach or suggest any way of distinguishing approved and
> unapproved electronic message.

    b. Regarding *a*, the examiner respectfully disagrees. As an initial matter,

        communications filed 03/14/2005 disclose that, "...the applied references fail to

        disclose either displaying representations of the electronic message to the

        first and second approvers, or the type of synchronizing performed by the

claimed invention (page 10, last paragraph)." Therefore, applicant is admitting that synchronization is used in the instant claimed invention.

However, Appellant's response dated 08/06/2007, Appellant states, "[i]t should be understood that the current invention is not limited to situations in which some form of synchronization is used or required"..."Nothing in the specification implies that synchronization is an essential element regarding notification. Nothing in the specification explicitly precludes other forms of notifying...Further, paragraph [0025] describes a child receiving notice when messages are rejected. The specification therefore clearly describes notification of electronic message status in forms other than through synchronization."

Despite the reversal in stance, the examiner maintains the first admission that the invention involves synchronizing folders between multiple approvers. Bulfer discloses an "approval folder" for approved messages (par. 0025; fig. 3, notice the checkmarks in figure 3 *indicating* if a message has been approved or not). Therefore, Sherman was added in combination to teach the concept of synchronizing the approved folders (of Bulfer).

Therefore, the combination of Lu, Bulfer and Sherman disclose "once the electronic message is approved or rejected by one approver (Lu), notifying the at least one other approver of a changed status for the electronic message (Bulfer and Sherman)".

Response to Argument D

4. Regarding claim 18, applicant's argument is the same as argument C for the reasons

set forth above. Please see the above response to arguments.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the

Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/AG/
12/07/2010

Conferees:

/Ashok B. Patel/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2491

/Beatriz Prieto/

WQAS, TC 2400